

**DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT**  
**Local Advisory Council Meeting**  
**February 11, 2004**  
**Notes**

**Purpose:** To discuss the progress of the DIFT Project.

**Attendance:** See attached.

**Discussion:**

Mohammed Alghurabi thanked everyone for attending. He indicated that the information developed for the January LAC meeting was included in the February packet and would be discussed tonight. He then asked those in attendance to introduce themselves. He indicated that those that were LAC members would be provided the opportunity to speak first and, consistent with the agenda, a segment would be available at the latter part of the meeting for others to comment.

**Review of Notes**

Mohammed Alghurabi asked for a review of notes that were included in the agenda packet from the meetings of November (revised December 10<sup>th</sup>), December and January. Chuck Goedert indicated that he had a number of comments on the December notes: 1) on page 5, first full paragraph under the REMI model; 2) page 6, the fourth and fifth paragraphs on that page; and, 3) page 8, the last paragraph beginning on that page. Chuck Goedert also indicated he disagreed with the comments made by Joe Corradino, as they relate to the CN/Moterm terminal and as reported in the December 10<sup>th</sup> notes, on the bottom of page 6 and the top of page 7. He indicated he remembers playing at Softball City and viewing the CN containers. Joe Corradino disagreed with Chuck Goedert in that his (Joe's) comments at the December LAC meeting dealt with a comparison to the activity levels at the CN/Moterm terminal through the late 1990s and those forecast for the year 2025. Therefore, the notes referring to this matter have not been adjusted.

Kathryn Savoie then commented about the December notes on page 2 and her concern about the schedule as shown on the DIFT Web site and the timing of public availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. She indicated that the schedule is still not accurate and should be adjusted. She asked Mohammed Alghurabi when the DEIS would be made available. He indicated, as he did at the on December LAC meeting, that it would be in the summer of 2004.

Joe Corradino indicated that the schedule is to deliver to MDOT the consultant's input to the DEIS in April 2004. Then, following MDOT review, it is anticipated that the public hearing on the DEIS would be in the summer 2004. Kathryn Savoie again stressed that that is not what is depicted on the Web site and asked that the schedule be updated.

Bill Schrader suggested to the members of the LAC that it would be more appropriate if they provided to MDOT their changes on the notes in advance of the meeting. Chuck Goedert responded that he also encourages that procedure, but he indicated that he often does not receive the notes in a timely manner. Therefore, he reserves the right to comment at the LAC meeting on any modifications to the notes that he feels appropriate.

Karen Kavanaugh asked about the comments made on pages 9 and 10 of the December LAC meeting notes indicating the background information on the REMI model was presented to the LAC in August 2002. Joe Corradino indicated that he believed that that was correct and that essentially the same information presented in December 2002 was made available to the LAC at its August 2002 meeting. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that between August 2002 and the present time, the REMI modeling work has become more focused. Joe Corradino indicated that a chart in the materials submitted to the LAC in August 2002 is at the core of the economic analysis, i.e., the number of jobs gained and lost as a result of intermodal expansion as well as the number of jobs and taxes created by construction. Karen Kavanaugh asked if these were The Corradino Group's materials. Joe Corradino indicated that neither the materials in August 2002 nor December 2003 was that of Corradino but of the REMI consultants.

### **Updated Commodity-flow Model**

Joe Corradino indicated that the updated commodity-flow model was included in the agenda packet. He noted that, in response to a comment made by Chris Gulock in November, when the commodity-flow model was originally presented to the LAC, that a check of the No Action forecast at the low end of the range was undertaken in cooperation with the railroads. Two of the railroads responded; one indicating that the low end of the range for No Action could be around 600,000 annual lifts, which is what the commodity-flow model forecasts. Another railroad indicated that the number of lifts could be as low as 500,000 under the No Action scenario. Therefore, Joe Corradino indicated that 500,000 annual lifts would be low end of the range used for the No Action alternative in the DEIS analyses. It would be compared to the high end of the

ranges for the action alternatives (Alternative 2: Improve/Expand Existing Terminals, and Alternative 3: Consolidate Terminals) because this would allow the greatest impacts to be understood. There were no questions or comments on this matter.

### **Social/Cultural Effects Evaluation**

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the social/cultural effects evaluation had been developed and reviewed by the consultant in cooperation with MDOT and FHWA technical personnel. It was first made available after the January LAC meeting and distributed to members by mail as well as posted on the Web

Joe Corradino explained the overall social/cultural effects methodology indicating that it not only focuses on those populations covered by environmental justice issues but other groups that might be sensitive because of their unique history and social characteristics. Therefore, while the environmental justice categories included African-Americans, Native Americans, native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, Hispanics, Asians, and low-income populations, additional groups added to the analysis include the Arab population, English, French (except Basque), Germans, Irish, Italians, Polish and Scottish. He then, with use of graphics, displayed the locations of both the EJ-oriented populations and the other populations that are included in the social/cultural effects evaluation. He noted that the original impact area around the Livernois-Junction/CP/Expressway terminals had been modified by adding zip code 48217, also known as the South Schaefer area. This was done after a request by Representative Tobocman.

Following the presentation, Kathryn Savoie asked if it were correct that a population group in a Census tract that does not meet the threshold established by reviewing characteristics of that population in the overall Detroit urbanized area will not be examined in the analysis. Joe Corradino indicated that is correct for that Census tract. He continued, that an overlay of the characteristics of these various populations is likely to cover virtually the entire terminal impact assessment area that has been defined for analysis purposes.

Olga Savic asked, if the overlay of the various characteristics had been completed. Joe Corradino indicated that, while it has been accomplished for internal analysis purposes, it had not been completed for presentation purposes.

Olga Savic commented that the poverty level data is all-reaching. She then asked if a Census tract includes more households than the urbanized area average of about 10 percent below the poverty level established by the U.S. government, if it is included in the social/cultural evaluation. Joe Corradino indicated yes and referred to a graphic in the presentation.

Joe Corradino then referred to a preliminary list of contacts to be made during the social/cultural evaluation process. He asked for input by LAC members of additional groups/individuals that they believe should be contacted. He indicated that, as the list grows, the contacts will be prioritized consistent with the resources available for the analysis. Olga Savic stated that the preliminary list of contacts appeared to be more citywide than community-specific. She suggested that groups like Bridging Communities and United Citizens of Southwest Detroit be included in the list. Again, the LAC members were urged to provide this kind of input so that the list could be appropriately tailored.

Olga Savic requested clarification of how the analysis would affect neighborhood issues. Joe Corradino indicated a key-streets analysis in each terminal area will be undertaken to define the degree to which intermodal transportation would create positive/negative effects on community/neighborhood facilities.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if the groups/individuals that the list is considering are social service agencies and church organizations, as examples. Joe Corradino responded yes.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if the zip code 48217 has been added to both the social/cultural evaluation and the economic impact analysis. Joe Corradino said it is only part of the social/cultural evaluation as it was not possible to modify the overall economic model when the request for the inclusion of this Census tract was made.

Olga Savic asked that the MDOT team provide monthly indications of those groups/individuals which it contacts during the social/cultural effects evaluation. Mohammed Alghurabi agreed.

## **Public Meeting Format**

Bob Parsons indicated that the format for the March meetings (March 29, 30, 31 and April 1) would be the combined open forum/public presentation/Q&A session as was conducted in the September round of public meetings. He asked for input on the locations for the public meetings and the timing of the presentation/Q&A session.

Kathryn Savoie asked the content of the upcoming public meetings so Bob Parsons' question could be answered. Joe Corradino indicated that five topics would be focused upon: the size of the terminal areas; economic impacts; traffic analysis; the social/cultural effects analysis; and, air quality. Kathryn Savoie asked who would be the presenter of the information. Joe Corradino indicated that he would be the principal presenter during the formal presentation/Q&A session. During the open forum session, other members of the team would be involved.

Bill Schrader asked if there were any way the railroads can provide projections about what they are going to do and if there is a way to depict how items like the terminal entryway/gate would look other than in engineering drawings. Joe Corradino responded that drawings are being and have been provided to the LAC to reflect the thinking of the railroads for their future, if government funding is provided. He also indicated that non-engineering graphics/pictures are available, and have been used in the past, to depict terminal gates and other items, like sound walls.

Marc Higginbotham noted that NS, as one of four railroads providing intermodal in the region, has no plans for terminal development outside those that have been made available to the MDOT project team and presented to the LAC.

Father Joe Redican asked for a clarification of the purpose of the March meetings. He specifically wanted to know if the public were going to be informed of any final decisions or when they were going to be made. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that an updated timeline for the decision-making process will be available at the meeting. Kathryn Savoie indicated that such information should not just be presented as a graphic but articulated verbally.

Father Redican indicated that one of the confusing issues associated with the upcoming public meetings will be the developments by CSX for its gate at the Waterman/Dix area. Father

Redican suggested that CSX be invited to the meetings to answer questions. Karen Kavanaugh indicated that she believed that MDOT could also be asked to respond to questions on this issue. Joe Corradino indicated, on the part of the DIFT MDOT technical team, that the future of the gate at Dix/Waterman would be a simple matter to explain. He noted that plans have been discussed publicly in the past on this issue. Kathryn Savoie indicated that MDOT is funding approximately half of the current improvements to the Livernois-Junction Yard and that it should be responsible for answering questions about the current changes at that location. Mohammed Alghurabi and Joe Corradino explained that MDOT is an organization of several thousand people and that a different group inside MDOT is responsible for the Dix/Waterman gate per the current CSX plans to improve the Livernois-Junction Yard. They indicated it is not a DIFT project. Father Redican stated that response will be very difficult to get across to the local community. Furthermore, he indicated that, if the DIFT MDOT project team is not able to discuss the Dix/Waterman issue, that will not bode well for the involvement of MDOT in moving the DIFT Project forward. Joe Corradino disagreed. He indicated that, in order for the DIFT Project to move forward, the railroads must enter into an agreement with MDOT that will establish the responsibilities for implementing recommendations to improve the terminals as part of the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project.

Olga Savic asked Bob Parsons to deliver to MDOT management the concern about having a representative at the DIFT public meetings in March to discuss the current plans/actions to improve the Livernois-Junction Yard. Bob Parsons indicated that he would take that matter up with MDOT's Communications Office.

On the public meetings themselves, Chuck Goedert indicated he had a concern about making the notice of the meetings better timed and better understood than in the past. Joe Corradino indicated that it was the intention to once again mail a notice of the meeting to 15,000 households/businesses. He indicated that about 3,000 of those mailings would be through local neighborhood organizations.

Chuck Goedert stressed that a more effective communication piece than the one used earlier is necessary. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that he would provide a draft mailer to the LAC as soon as possible for its comment. However, immediate comment would be due if the mailer is to be appropriately translated into Spanish and Arabic and distributed on a timely basis.

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that Donald-Ray Smith of the Detroit Planning and Development Department offered to distribute information about the meetings if he could get a flyer by the early part of March. Kathryn Savoie indicated that a mailer should be sent to every person that ever attended a DIFT meeting. She asserted that these people do not get notices even though they have made an effort to attend a DIFT meeting. Joe Corradino indicated that he believed that those people who have attended all DIFT public meetings in the past are on the mailing list. He would check into that matter.

Bob Parsons then asked about the timing of the presentation/question-and-answer period at the March public meetings. A number of comments were made indicating that a 2-hour presentation/Q&A period should begin either at 6:00 p.m. or 7:00 p.m. Bob Parsons and Mohammed Alghurabi indicated they would take the information back and make a decision on when the presentation/Q&A period would begin.

Bob Parsons then asked about locations for each of the four meetings. Karen Kavanaugh suggested that the IBEW Union Hall would be a good location. Olga Savic indicated that, in terms of the Grandmont area, a facility other than the Dearborn Holiday Inn may be appropriate. Kathryn Savoie suggested that if a location is desired in the Dearborn area, the Salina School is appropriate. She suggested that the Rosedale Park location for the February 2002 meetings may be an appropriate location for the Grandmont-CP/Oak terminal meeting.

It was also suggested that the Fairgrounds would be an appropriate place for the meeting covering the CN/Moterm-Ferndale area. Chuck Goedert commented that rooms in the Fairgrounds often have difficult acoustics. He also suggested that all public comments and responses should be recorded.

Bob Parsons and Mohammed Alghurabi concluded discussion on public meetings by indicating that all these issues would be taken under advisement and the LAC would be informed of decisions at the earliest opportunity.

### **Air Quality Analysis Area**

Joe Corradino referred to maps in the agenda packet indicating where the air quality burden analysis would take place, consistent with the Air Toxics Air Quality Protocol discussed in

November with the LAC. He indicated within each area an emissions burden would be developed. Kathryn Savoie asked for a definition of pollution burden. Joe Corradino indicated that it was a total quantity of emissions produced by mobile sources in that area. He indicated that the pollution burden would not be dispersed to individual locations throughout the community.

Olga Savic asked how a pollution burden analysis would allow for a determination of health effects. Joe Corradino indicated that a health risk assessment was not part of the Air Toxics Air Quality Protocol. Nevertheless, to the extent that information from the state Department of Community Health or other similar groups is available about health effects around the terminals, it would be reflected in the analysis.

Kathryn Savoie asked how the air quality effects on each sensitive population would be measured. Joe Corradino indicated that a carbon monoxide (precursor to ozone) concentration analysis would be conducted at a number of “hot spots” in each of the terminal areas. This would allow a judgment to be made of that pollutant’s effect on the sensitive populations. However, this analysis would only cover carbon monoxide and not particulate matter nor air toxics. With respect to air quality standards, the only standard for which conformity is now required by the federal government is ozone. Therefore, the carbon monoxide/ozone issues at the regional level will be analyzed for SEMCOG for a conformity determination. This, too, would allow alternatives to be compared.

Olga Savic asked if it is possible to conduct dispersion modeling of air toxics and particulate matter. Joe Corradino indicated that there are a number of techniques to conduct dispersion modeling. He cited that one was used in the DIFT Feasibility Study through an EPA-approved model. However, since the DIFT Feasibility Study, the Federal Highway Administration has indicated that, because conformity has not been defined for air toxics and for particulate matter, and because the science/modeling is not confirmed to be effective, that dispersion modeling of air toxics and particulate matter would not be conducted.

## **VACIS**

Joe Corradino referred to material in the handout dealing with the railroad car radar inspection device known as VACIS. He indicated that a number of locations for the system had been



discussed including one between the Livernois-Junction Yard and the Michigan Central Depot. However, after extensive discussions, it was decided the VACIS system would be located towards the Windsor Airport near Walker Road. It is likely the system will be installed sometime in 2005.

### **Detroit City Council Meeting on CSX**

Mohammed Alghurabi asked for an update on the City Council meeting on February 6<sup>th</sup> dealing with CSX introduction of a gate to a portion of the Livernois-Junction Yard at Dix and Waterman. Karen Kavanaugh indicated that the discussion at the City Council meeting has led to a follow-up meeting that will be held on February 12<sup>th</sup> in the field with CSX. Olga Savic indicated that there seems to be a willingness on the part of CSX to listen to all parties to see if an agreement can be reached on a short-term solution, while a longer-term alternative is being considered.

Mohammed Alghurabi stressed that the developments at the Livernois-Junction Yard are the result of a loan program available at MDOT. Bill Schrader requested a copy of the program's specifications. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that it would be provided.

Father Redican stated that, if any accommodation were made as a result of the meeting with CSX, the results should be made public.

### **Other Materials**

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that interesting materials had been provided in the agenda packet for review by the LAC members. Chuck Goedert mentioned a newspaper article had indicated there are safety hazards associated with trucks used in intermodal activity. He asked if such hazards would be part of the DIFT analysis. Joe Corradino indicated that the specific hazards associated with equipment would not be part of the safety analysis. Instead, crash rates associated with characteristics of the automotive and railroad activities would be used. Chuck Goedert indicated that this would then mask safety concerns. Greg Gorno indicated that the issue of safe equipment is a "hot topic" in the intermodal industry and that legislation would be forthcoming to address inadequate equipment maintenance.

Kathryn Savoie asked again if the draft EIS will be presented to the public in the summer of 2004. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated it would.

### **Public Comment**

Minnie Ramirez indicated that she agreed with the comment by Bill Schrader that some architectural “rendering” should be shown to illustrate to the public the characteristics of the intermodal terminal operations. She also indicated that she understood that the social/cultural evaluation was being conducted with the use of Census information. She stressed that Census information is not completely accurate. She also commented that her organization, CHASS, sees the health ramifications of truck activity in the community. She noted that U of M, in cooperation with Community Action Against Asthma, is surveying 300 individuals in the community to determine the health effects of particulate matter. She noted that on 9/11 there was a rise in particulate matter in southwest Detroit. She indicated a concern about the overall DIFT air quality analysis.

Father Redican commented that the issue of air quality was a matter of a discussion at a meeting the prior evening on the potential for a new border crossing. He noted that, at that meeting, the difference between the Canadian approach and the U.S. approach was discussed. He stressed that it is the responsibility of individual citizens to talk to their political leadership to require all federal agencies to tighten the air quality standards and to cause use of the most effective approaches in measuring the impacts of pollution on the local population.

Minnie Ramirez indicated that the timing of public comments at the latter part of the LAC meeting was unacceptable.

A member of the Jeffries/Southfield Community indicated that truck activity in her area is bad. She asked if the impact on the roads were being analyzed as it relates to the DIFT Project. Joe Corradino stated that changes were being contemplated to remove as much traffic from the local streets and the Southfield service drive as possible at the CP/Oak terminal, if it were improved with government assistance. This could include a new entryway to the Jeffries Freeway (I-96) at Evergreen Road. He noted, however, that the DIFT team is not looking into the normal maintenance/repairs of individual roads.

Josephine Powell asked if businesses were included in public mailings for the DIFT meetings. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated yes. Father Redican stated that he receives two mailers for each DIFT meeting, one at his home as a resident, and the other at Holy Redeemer School as a “business.”

Josephine Powell asked if, during the air quality analysis, an assessment would be made of the pollution being generated by the railroad activities as well as trucks. Joe Corradino indicated that the answer was yes for the terminal area in terms of pollution burden. Josephine Powell asked what was then going to be done with the data. Joe Corradino explained the analysis of emissions burden and the comparison of alternatives by terminal area. He indicated that a conformity analysis would be conducted by SEMCOG on a regional basis. Josephine Powell indicated that the DIFT analysis that is being conducted is more limited because it is dealing with mobile sources (trucks and trains). When dealing with stationary sources, such as manufacturing plants, a broader analysis is undertaken. Joe Corradino indicated that he recognized the difference.

Josephine Powell indicated that within the next 60 days, a new ozone standard would be established and that southeast Michigan would then be in “non-attainment status.” Joe Corradino indicated that he understood this was the case and it has been taken into consideration on the DIFT project. However, he noted that conformity determinations for air toxics and particulate matter had not been resolved by EPA. When they are and if the DIFT Project is still underway, then they will be factored into the work.

Bethany Holland indicated that she is aware DIFT traffic at the CN/Moterm terminal will bring another 70 trucks into her “backyard” in the peak hour. She is concerned about traffic, air quality and safety. She noted that she is aware of the truck safety issue because her husband is a trucker.

Maria Anita Salinas indicated that health effects of truck activity do not seem to be an issue in the DIFT project, which is wrong. She stated that Community Action Against Asthma is asking for a survey to be conducted among the grass roots people as it relates to the health effects caused by air pollution. She indicated that a law should be established to require a health risk assessment. She asked the LAC if it would be appropriate for CAAA to make a presentation at

one of the LAC meetings. She commented that the last DIFT public meeting mailer was too “busy” to be understood. Finally, she asked who the decision-maker from the local community is on the DIFT project.

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the DIFT decisions are being made by MDOT. He indicated that there are various groups providing input to MDOT including the Local Advisory Council and the Steering Committee. Also, a group of local agencies provides input to the matter and meets monthly to do so. Karen Kavanaugh indicated that “there is not a lot of advising going on” by the LAC.

Maria Anita Salinas again asked if it would be appropriate to do a presentation to the LAC. Bill Schrader suggested instead that materials Maria Anita Salinas has available should be provided to Mohammed so he could distribute these to the LAC.

Father Redican indicated that he believes that the perspective of the local community’s needs must be considered in the DIFT process. He stated that the current local situation in southwest Detroit is not “paradise.” He indicated that things could get worse unless improvements were made. He stressed that, in order for improvements to be made, conversations between the neighborhoods and MDOT must be undertaken so that those who have the resources will be able to spend them on things that would be mutually beneficial. He concluded by saying that such conversations should take place soon.

Bruce King indicated that he represents the City at the LAC and is chair of the Local Agency Committee that meets monthly on DIFT issues. He stressed that the comments he receives as a result of LAC input are brought back to the City and are part of its decision-making process on the DIFT.

Felicity Leddy indicated that the DIFT study had been going on for too long. She questioned the need for the project. She indicated that she was hopeful that, as a result of the MDOT Transportation Summit, local communities would be able to partner with MDOT on various projects. She also referred to recent conversations about opening a new “port” that may be able to relieve intermodal traffic from the terminals now operating. She asked why it would not be appropriate to locate an intermodal terminal in an area away from those densely populated

locations in which they are currently operating. She concluded by saying she has never received a mailing on the project.

With that discussion, Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that there would likely be a meeting in the latter part of March for the LAC to review the proposed graphics for the upcoming public meetings. He indicated that he would advise the LAC of the time for that as soon as possible.

With that, the meeting concluded at 10:00 p.m.

*L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\LocalAdv.Feb11.doc*

**DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT**  
**Local Advisory Council Meeting**  
**February 11, 2004**

**Attendance**

**LAC Members**

Name	Representing	Address
Heidi Alcock	City of Detroit Planning Commission	
Todd T. Birkle	Oakland County	1200 N. Telegraph, Pontiac, MI 48341
Don Cameron	FHWA	Lansing, MI 48933
Chuck Goedert	City of Ferndale	821 W. Breckenridge, Ferndale, MI 48221
Greg Gorno	GTSI & Det. Intermodal Assn.	18673 Dix, Brownstown, MI 48192
Marc Higginbotham	Norfolk Southern	2000 Town Center Ste. 1900, Southfield, MI 48075
Victoria C. Inniss	Wayne County Govt. Affairs	600 Randolph, Suite 349, Detroit, MI 48226
Karen Kavanaugh	SDBA/CBRA	7752 W. Vernor, Detroit, MI 48209
Bruce M. King	City of Detroit, Dept. of Env. Affairs	660 Woodward Ave., Suite 1800, Detroit, MI 48226
Carmin Palombo	SEMOG	535 Griswold, Suite 300, Detroit, MI 48226
Fr. Joe Redican	Holy Redeemer Schools	5668 Baker St., Detroit, MI 48209
Olga Savic	Office of Rep. Tobocman	P.O. Box 30014, Lansing, MI 48909
Kathryn Savoie	CBRA	6450 Maple St., Dearborn, MI 48126
Bill Schraeder	Southfield Jeffries Bus. Assn.	13570 Auburn, Detroit, MI 48223

**LAC Observers**

Name	Representing	Address
Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT Design	425 W. Ottawa, Lansing, MI 48075
Fred Berry	Wayne Co. Homeland Security	600 Randolph, Detroit, MI 48226
Mickey Blashfield	Ambassador Bridge	12225 Stephens Rd., Warren, MI 48089
Scott A. Bradford	G.W.C.A.	20003 Renfrew, Detroit, MI 48221-1391
Chris Brayman	Dearborn Police	16099 Michigan, Dearborn, MI 48126
Bunyan Bryant	Env. Justice Initiative	1902 Independence, Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Byna Camden	Green Acres Woodward Civic. Assn.	2575 Woodstock, Detroit, MI 48203
Marty Connour	MARS Industries	3100 Lonyo, Detroit, MI 48209
Joe Corradino	The Corradino Group	535 Griswold, Suite 918, Detroit, MI 48226
Jeff Edwards	MDOT	
Anita Flies	Green Acres Woodward Civic Assn.	20059 Briarcliff, Detroit, MI 48221
Lisa Goldstein	SW Detroit Env. Vision/CBRA	1450 McKinstry, Detroit, MI 48209
Gia Grvet	Univ. of Michigan	1271 Wistena Dr., Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Jim Hartman	The Corradino Group	535 Griswold, Suite 918, Detroit, MI 48226
Elaine Hockman	U of Mich. and Wayne State	2142 Pauline #303, Ann Arbor, MI 48103
Bethany Holland	South End Homeowners Assn.	257 W. Chesterfield, Ferndale, MI 48220
Jane Kyriacopoulos	Green Acres Association	20176 Briarcliff, Detroit, MI 48221
John Kyriacopoulos	Green Acres Association	20176 Briarcliff, Detroit, MI 48221
Felicity Leddy	GWCA Detroit	20240 Lichfield, Detroit, MI 48221
Paul Max	Dept. of Health & Wellness Promotion	1151 Taylor Bldg. #4, Detroit, MI 48202
Amy McDonald	Univ. of Michigan	917 Packard Apt. 3, Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Janet Narich		706 Pinecrest, Ferndale, MI 48220

Name	Representing	Address
Olga Narich		706 Pinecrest, Ferndale, MI 48220
Bob Parsons	MDOT Public Involvement	P.O. Box 30050, Lansing, MI 48909
Brenda V. Peek	MDOT Communications	
Sherry Piacenti	MDOT	P.O. Box 30050, Lansing, MI 48909
Dorothy Pierce		20436 Briarcliff, Detroit, MI 48221
Josephine Powell	Wayne Co. Dept. of Environment	415 Clifford, Detroit, MI 48226
Minnie Ramirez		
Maria Anita Salinas	Comm. Action Against Asthma	1420 Washington Heights, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2029
Harvey Santana	The Corradino Group	535 Griswold, Suite 918, Detroit, MI 48226
Daniel Spiess	Univ. of Michigan	111 Ashley Mews, Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Chuck Tucker	City of Ferndale	521 E. Cambourne, Ferndale, MI 48220
Marjorie Van Hay	Grandmont Community Assn.	14044 Longacre, Detroit, MI 48227
Kimberly Wetzel	Univ. of Michigan	119 W. Mosley St., Ann Arbor, MI 48103
Lauren Zajac	Univ. of Michigan	1128 Michigan Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 48104

*L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\LocalAdv.Feb11.doc*